

INITIAL STUDY
City of Sunnyvale
Department of Community Development
Planning Division
P.O. Box 3707
Sunnyvale, CA 94088-3707

ATTACHMENT C
Page 1 of 19

Project #: 2005-0068 UP
Project Address: 704 Daffodil Court
Applicant: Metro PCS

1. Project Title: Use Permit for 704 Daffodil Court
2. Lead Agency Name and Address: City of Sunnyvale, Community Development Department,
Planning Division
3. Contact Person and Phone Number: Jamie McLeod, Associate Planner (408) 730-7429
4. Project Location: 704 Daffodil Court, Sunnyvale CA
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Telle Presley, Peacock Associates
5855 Doyle St. #108
Emeryville, CA 94608
6. General Plan Designation: Park
7. Zoning: PF (Public Facility)
8. Description of the Project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary)

2005-0068 – The applicant proposes to co-locate three telecommunication antennae at 103 feet above the ground on an existing 112-foot high PG&E lattice tower located in the public park near 704 Daffodil Court. Two other telecommunications carriers currently have antenna on the tower, Cingular Wireless and Sprint PCS. Ancillary equipment associated with the antennas is proposed to be located in a shed at the base of the tower. The applicant has submitted a radio frequency emissions report indicating compliance with FCC standards. The applicant will be required to obtain a building permit subsequent to planning approval of the project.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: (Briefly describe the project's surroundings) The site consists of a public park. Surrounding uses are a school (Braly Elementary School) to the north, single family homes to the south and east, and apartments to the west of the site.
10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financing approval, or participation agreement). The project has submitted emissions study and has met FCC exposure requirements.
Building Safety Division

Project #: 2005-0068 UP
 Project Address: 704 Daffodil Court
 Applicant: Metro PCS

INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

<input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials	<input type="checkbox"/> Public Services
<input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Recreation
<input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning	<input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic
<input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems
<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Noise	<input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance
<input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils	<input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing	

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared. X

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared. 0

I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required. 0

I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potential significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed. 0

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required. 0

Signature

Date

Jamie McLeod

Printed Name:

For: *City of Sunnyvale*

Project #: 2005-0068 UP
Project Address: 704 Daffodil Court
Applicant: Metro PCS

ATTACHMENT C
Page 3 of 19

INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL
CHECKLIST

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g. the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section 17, "Earlier Analysis," may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analysis may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c) (3) (d). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g. general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The analysis of each issue should identify: (a) the significance criteria or threshold used to evaluate each question; and (b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

Project #: 2005-0068 UP
Project Address: 704 Daffodil Court
Applicant: Metro PCS

ATTACHMENT C
Page 4 of 19

INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL
CHECKLIST

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------	--------

I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:

a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	0	0	0	X	2, 94
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	0	0	0	X	2,94
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	0	0	0	X	See disc.
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	0	0	0	X	2, 94

II. AIR QUALITY: Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	0	0	0	X	3,97, 100, 111
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.	0	0	0	X	3,97, 100, 111
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	0	0	0	X	3, 96, 97, 100, 111
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	0	0	0	X	62, 63, 111, 112
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	0	0	0	X	111, 112

Project #: 2005-0068 UP
 Project Address: 704 Daffodil Court
 Applicant: Metro PCS

INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------	--------

III. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES:

- | | | | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|---|---|-------------------------------|
| a. | Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | 0 | 0 | 0 | X | 2, 94,
111,
112,
109 |
| b. | Have a substantially adverse impact on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S Wildlife Service? | 0 | 0 | 0 | X | 2, 94,
111,
112,
109 |
| | <i>Storm Water Runoff Guidance:</i>
Include aquatic and wetland habitats as part of the sensitive habitat review. Also evaluate adverse changes to sensitive habitats that favor the development of mosquitoes and other biting flies that may pose a threat to public health. Aquatic and wetland habitats such as those found near Stevens Creek, Calabazas Creek, Sunnyvale East Channel, Sunnyvale West Channel, El Camino Channel, Moffett Channel, Guadalupe Slough and the Baylands are considered sensitive habitat areas. | | | | | |
| c. | Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? | 0 | 0 | 0 | X | 2, 94,
111,
112,
109 |
| d. | Interfere substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? | 0 | 0 | 0 | X | 2, 94,
111,
112,
109 |
| e. | Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? | 0 | 0 | 0 | X | 41,
94,
111,
112 |
| f. | Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? | 0 | 0 | 0 | X | 2, 41,
94,
111,
112 |

Project #: 2005-0068 UP
Project Address: 704 Daffodil Court
Applicant: Metro PCS

ATTACHMENT C
Page 6 of 19
**INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL
CHECKLIST**

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------	--------

IV. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?	0	0	0	X	10, 42, 60, 61, 94, 111
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resources pursuant to Section 15064.5?	0	0	0	X	10, 42, 94
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	0	0	0	X	10, 42, 94, 111
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	0	0	0	X	2, 11, 112

V. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:

a. Physically divide an established community?	0	0	0	X	2, 11, 12, 21, 28
b. Conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	0	0	0	X	31, 28, 111
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan?	0	0	0	X	2, 41, 94, 111

VI. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	0	0	0	X	2, 94
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	0	0	0	X	2, 94

Project #: 2005-0068 UP
 Project Address: 704 Daffodil Court
 Applicant: Metro PCS

ATTACHMENT C
 Page 7 of 19

INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL
CHECKLIST

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------	--------

VII. NOISE. Would the project result in:

a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	0	0	0	X	2, 16, 26, 94, 111, 112
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	0	0	0	X	2, 16, 26, 94, 111, 112
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	0	0	0	X	2, 16, 26, 94, 111, 112
d. A substantially temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	0	0	0	X	2, 16, 26, 94, 111, 112

VIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	0	0	0	X	2, 11, 111, 112
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	0	0	0	X	2, 11, 111, 112
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	0	0	0	X	2, 11, 111, 112

Project #: 2005-0068 UPProject Address: 704 Daffodil CourtApplicant: Metro PCSINITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL
CHECKLIST

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------	--------

IX. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, need for new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

a. Parks?	0	0	0	X	2, 18, 11, 112 UFC/ UBC/ SMC
b. Fire protection?	0	0	0	X	
c. Schools?	0	0	0	X	2, 11, 112
d. Other public facilities?	0	0	0	X	2, 111, 112
e. Police protection?	0	0	0	X	26, 65, 66, 103, 104

X. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	0	0	0	X	2, 10, 26, 42, 59, 60, 61, 111, 112
b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of the past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	0	0	0	X	1, 2, 111, 112
c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	0	0	0	X	111, 112

Project #: 2005-0068 UP
Project Address: 704 Daffodil Court
Applicant: Metro PCS

ATTACHMENT C
Page 9 of 19

INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL
CHECKLIST

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------	--------

XI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

- a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:
- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|--------------------|
| (i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. | 0 | 0 | 0 | X | UBC, UPC, UMC, NEC |
| (ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? | 0 | 0 | 0 | X | UBC, UPC, UMC, NEC |
| (iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | 0 | 0 | 0 | X | UBC, UPC, UMC, NEC |
| (iv) Landslides? | 0 | 0 | 0 | X | UBC, UPC, UMC, NEC |
- b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?
- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|--------------------|
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | X | UBC, UPC, UMC, NEC |
|--|---|---|---|---|--------------------|
- c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?
- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|--------------------|
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | X | UBC, UPC, UMC, NEC |
|--|---|---|---|---|--------------------|
- d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-a-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?
- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|--------------------|
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | X | UBC, UPC, UMC, NEC |
|--|---|---|---|---|--------------------|
- e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?
- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|--------------------|
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | X | UBC, UPC, UMC, NEC |
|--|---|---|---|---|--------------------|

Project #: 2005-0068 UP
Project Address: 704 Daffodil Court
Applicant: Metro PCS

ATTACHMENT C
Page 10 of 19

INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL
CHECKLIST

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------	--------

XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	0	0	0	X	2, 20, 24, 25, 87-90, 111, 112
b. Require or result in construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	0	0	0	X	2, 20, 24, 25, 87-90, 111, 112
c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	0	0	0	X	2, 20, 24, 25, 87-90, 111, 112
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	0	0	0	X	2, 20, 24, 25, 87-90, 111, 112
e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that services or may serve the project determined that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	0	0	0	X	2, 20, 24, 25, 87-90, 111, 112
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	0	0	0	X	2, 22, 90, 111, 112
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	0	0	0	X	2, 22, 90, 111, 112

Project #: 2005-0068 UP
 Project Address: 704 Daffodil Court
 Applicant: Metro PCS

ATTACHMENT C
 Page 11 of 19

INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL
CHECKLIST

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------	--------

XIII. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:

a. Cause an increase in the traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	0	0	0	X	2, 12, 71, 75, 76, 77, 111, 112
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	0	0	0	X	2, 71, 75, 76, 77, 80, 84, 11, 112
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	0	0	0	X	2, 111, 112, 113
d. Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?	0	0	0	X	2, 12, 71, 75, 76, 77, 80, 84, 111, 112
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?	0	0	0	X	2, 11, 112
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?	0	0	0	X	2, 37, 111, 112
g. Conflict with adopted policies or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	0	0	0	X	2, 12, 81, 111, 112

Project #: 2005-0068 UP
 Project Address: 704 Daffodil Court
 Applicant: Metro PCS

INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------	--------

XIV. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project?

a.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?	0	0	0	X	UFC/ UBC/ SMC
b.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the likely release of hazardous materials into the environment?	0	0	0	X	UFC/ UBC/ SMC
c.	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	0	0	X	0	UFC/ UBC/ SMC
d.	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	0	0	0	X	UFC/ UBC/ SMC
e.	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	0	0	0	X	UFC/ UBC/ SMC
f.	Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	0	0	0	X	UFC/ UBC/ SMC
g.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	0	0	0	X	UFC/ UBC/ SMC

Project #: 2005-0068 UP
 Project Address: 704 Daffodil Court
 Applicant: Metro PCS

ATTACHMENT C
 Page 13 of 19

INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL
CHECKLIST

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------	--------

XV. RECREATION

- | | | | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|---|---|----------------------|
| a. | Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? | 0 | 0 | 0 | X | 2, 18,
11,
112 |
| b. | Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | 0 | 0 | 0 | X | 2, 18,
11,
112 |

XIX. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project?

- | | | | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| a. | Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency to non-agricultural use? | 0 | 0 | 0 | X | 94 |
| b. | Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | 0 | 0 | 0 | X | 94 |
| c. | Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? | 0 | 0 | 0 | X | 94 |

Project #: 2005-0068 UPProject Address: 704 Daffodil CourtApplicant: Metro PCSINITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL
CHECKLIST

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------	--------

XX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project?

- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|------------------------------|
| a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? | 0 | 0 | 0 | X | 2, 24,
25,
111,
112 |
| (i.) Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, will it result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired? | 0 | 0 | 0 | X | 2, 24,
25,
111,
112 |
| (ii.) Will the proposed project cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses? | 0 | 0 | 0 | X | 2, 24,
25,
111,
112 |
- Storm Water Runoff Guidance:*
For example, projects that could increase pollutant discharges such as mercury, copper, nickel, sediment, organophosphate pesticides, PCBs, or other listed contaminants will need to address those impacts.
- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|------------------------------|
| b. Substantially degrade groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? | 0 | 0 | 0 | X | 2, 24,
25,
111,
112 |
|---|---|---|---|---|------------------------------|

Project #: 2005-0068 UP
 Project Address: 704 Daffodil Court
 Applicant: Metro PCS

INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL
CHECKLIST

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? <i>Storm Water Runoff Guidance:</i> Evaluation of a project's effect on drainage patterns should refer to the final approved SCVURPPP Hydromodification Management Plan (HMP) where applicable, to assess the significance of altering existing drainage patterns and to develop any mitigation measures. The evaluation of hydromodification effects should also consider any potential for streambed or bank erosion downstream from the project.	0	0	0	X	2, 24, 25, 111, 112, SMC 12.60
d. Create or contribute runoff which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	0	0	0	X	2, 24, 25, 111, 112,
(i.) Will the proposed project result in increased impervious surfaces and associated increased runoff?	0	0	0	X	2, 24, 25, 111, 112
(ii.) If so, does the project meet the NPDES permit's Group 1 or Group 2 criteria?	0	0	0	X	2, 24, 25, 111, 112
<i>Storm Water Runoff Guidance:</i> If applicable, document Best Management Practices in fulfillment of Provision C.3 requirements as CEQA mitigation measures.					

Project #: 2005-0068 UP
 Project Address: 704 Daffodil Court
 Applicant: Metro PCS

ATTACHMENT C

Page 16 of 19

INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL
CHECKLIST

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source
e. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	0	0	0	X	2, 24, 25, 111, 112,
(i.) Would the proposed project result in an increase in pollutant discharges to receiving waters? <i>Storm Water Runoff Guidance:</i> Consider water quality parameters such as temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity and other typical storm water pollutants (e.g., heavy metals, pathogens, petroleum derivatives, synthetic organics, sediment, nutrients, oxygen-demanding substances, and trash).	0	0	0	X	2, 24, 25, 111, 112,
(ii.) Does the project have the potential to result in a significant impact to surface water quality, marine, fresh, or wetland waters, or to groundwater quality?	0	0	0	X	2, 24, 25, 111, 112,
(iii.) Will the project result in avoiding creation of mosquito larval sources that would subsequently require chemical treatment to protect human and animal health?	0	0	0	X	2, 24, 25, 111, 112,
f. Place housing within a 100-year floodplain, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	0	0	0	X	2, 12, 19, 24, 111, 112
g. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	0	0	0	X	2, 19, 24, 111, 112
h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	0	0	0	X	2, 19, 24, 25, 111, 112

Project #: 2005-0068 UP
Project Address: 704 Daffodil Court
Applicant: Metro PCS

ATTACHMENT C
Page 17 of 19

INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL
CHECKLIST

i. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	0	0	0	X	2, 19, 24, 25, 111, 112
---	---	---	---	---	-------------------------------------

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS THAT ARE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT

Hazards and Hazardous Materials Impact: This project will emit hazardous emissions within one-quarter mile of an existing school. However, both the individual and the combined impact of the radio frequency energy to be emitted from the tower has been determined to "comply with the prevailing standards for limiting public exposure" and will therefore not cause a significant impact on the environment.

Completed By: **Jamie McLeod, Associate Planner**

Date: **March 3, 2005**

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST REFERENCE LIST

Note: All references are for the most recent version, as of the date the Initial Study was prepared.

City of Sunnyvale General Plan:

1. Map
2. Air Quality Sub-Element
3. Community Design Sub-Element
4. Community Participation Sub-Element
5. Cultural Arts Sub-Element
6. Executive Summary
7. Fire Services Sub-Element
8. Fiscal Sub-Element
9. Heritage Preservation Sub-Element
10. Housing & Community Revitalization Sub-Element
11. Land Use & Transportation Sub-Element
12. Law Enforcement Sub-Element
13. Legislative Management Sub-Element
14. Library Sub-Element
15. Noise Sub-Element
16. Open Space Sub-Element.
17. Recreation Sub-Element
18. Safety & Seismic Safety Sub-Element
19. Sanitary Sewer System Sub-Element
20. Socio-Economic Sub-Element
21. Solid Waste Management Sub-Element
22. Support Services Sub-Element
23. Surface Run-off Sub-Element
24. Water Resources Sub-Element

City of Sunnyvale Municipal Code:

25. Chapter 10
26. Chapter 12.60 Storm Water Management
27. Chapter 19.18. Residential Zoning Districts
28. Chapter 19.20. Commercial Zoning Districts
29. Chapter 19.22. Industrial Zoning Districts
30. Chapter 19.24. Office Zoning Districts
31. Chapter 19.26. Combining Zoning Districts
32. Chapter 19.28. Downtown Specific Plan
33. Chapter 19.42. Operating Standards
34. Chapter 19.46. Off-Street Parking & Loading
35. Chapter 19.56. Solar Access
36. Chapter 19.66. Affordable Housing
37. Chapter 19.72. Conversion of Mobile Home Parks to Other Uses
38. Chapter 19.94. Tree Preservation
39. Chapter 19.96. Heritage Preservation

Specific Plans:

40. Downtown Specific Plan (SMC 19.28)
41. El Camino Real Precise Plan
42. Lockheed Site Master Use Permit
43. Moffett Field Comprehensive Use Plan
44. 101 & Lawrence Site Specific Plan
45. Southern Pacific Corridor Plan

Environmental Impact Reports:

46. Futures Study Environmental Impact Report
47. Lockheed Site Master Use Permit Environmental Impact Report
48. Tasman Corridor LRT Environmental Impact Study (supplemental)
49. Kaiser Permanente Medical Center Replacement Center Environmental Impact Report (City of Santa Clara)
50. Downtown Development Program Environmental Impact Report
51. Caribbean-Moffett Park Environmental Impact Report
52. Southern Pacific Corridor Plan Environmental Impact Report

Maps:

53. Zoning Map
54. City of Sunnyvale Aerial Maps
55. Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FEMA)
56. Santa Clara County Assessors Parcel
57. Utility Maps (50 scale)

Lists / Inventories:

58. Sunnyvale Cultural Resources Inventory List
59. Heritage Landmark Designation List
60. Santa Clara County Heritage Resource Inventory
61. Hazardous Waste & Substances Sites List (State of California)
62. List of Known Contaminants in Sunnyvale

Legislation / Acts / Bills / Codes:

63. Subdivision Map Act

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST REFERENCE LIST

ATTACHMENT C
Page 19 of 19

Note: All references are the most recent version as of the date the initial Study was prepared:

- 64. Uniform Fire Code, including amendments per SMC adoption
- 65. National Fire Code (National Fire Protection Association)
- 66. Title 19 California Administrative Code
- 67. California Assembly Bill 2185 / 2187 (Waters Bill)
- 68. California Assembly Bill 3777 (La Follette Bill)
- 69. Superfund Amendments & Reauthorization Act (SARA) Title III

Transportation:

- 70. California Department of Transportation Highway Design Manual
- 71. California Department of Transportation Traffic Manual
- 72. California Department of Transportation Standard Plan
- 73. California Department of Transportation Standard Specification
- 74. Institute of Transportation Engineers - Trip Generation
- 75. Institute of Transportation Engineers Transportation and Traffic Engineering Handbook
- 76. U.S. Dept. of Transportation Federal Highway Admin. Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Street and Highways
- 77. California Vehicle Code
- 78. Traffic Engineering Theory & Practice by L. J. Pegnataro
- 79. Santa Clara County Congestion Management Program and Technical Guidelines
- 80. Santa Clara County Transportation Agency Short Range Transit Plan
- 81. Santa Clara County Transportation Plan
- 82. Traffic Volume Studies, City of Sunnyvale Public works Department of Traffic Engineering Division
- 83. Santa Clara County Sub-Regional Deficiency Plan
- 84. Bicycle Plan

Public Works:

- 85. Standard Specifications and Details of the Department of Public Works

- 86. Storm Drain Master Plan
- 87. Sanitary Sewer Master Plan
- 88. Water Master Plan
- 89. Solid Waste Management Plan of Santa Clara County
- 90. Geotechnical Investigation Reports
- 91. Engineering Division Project Files
- 92. Subdivision and Parcel Map Files

Miscellaneous:

- 93. Field Inspection
- 94. Environmental Information Form
- 95. Annual Summary of Containment Excesses (BAAQMD)
- 96. Current Air Quality Data
- 97. Chemical Emergency Preparedness Program (EPA) Interim Document in 1985?)
- 98. Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) Population Projections
- 99. Bay Area Clean Air Plan
- 100. City-wide Design Guidelines
- 101. Industrial Design Guidelines

Building Safety:

- 102. Uniform Building Code, Volume 1, (Including the California Building Code, Volume 1)
- 103. Uniform Building Code, Volume 2, (Including the California Building Code, Volume 2)
- 104. Uniform Plumbing Code, (Including the California Plumbing Code)
- 105. Uniform Mechanical Code, (Including the California Mechanical Code)
- 106. National Electrical Code (Including California Electrical Code)
- 107. Title 16 of the Sunnyvale Municipal Code

Additional References:

- 108. USFWS / CA Dept. F&G Special Status Lists
- 109. Project Traffic Impact Analysis
- 110. Project Description
- 111. Project Development Plans
- 112. Santa Clara County Airport Land Use Plan
- 113. Federal Aviation Administration
- 114. Site Map